

Minutes
CRIMINAL JUSTICE PARTNERSHIP
ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
May 16, 2007

Board Members Present: Chairperson Ann McKown, District Court Judge; Vice Chairman Wes Crabtree, Office of the Sheriff; Secretary Robin Odom, NC Department of Labor; Lao Rubert, Carolina Justice Policy Center; Marcia Owen, Victim Services; Gayle Harris, Public Health; Geoff Hathaway, Community Corrections; Lafonda General, Member At Large; Carolyn Titus, Deputy County Manager; Sadie Alger, Substance Abuse; Riley Butler, Community-Based Corrections Program;

Board Members Absent: Ellen Holliman, Mental Health; Antoinette Hilliard, Public Defender's Office; Kenneth Titus, Superior Court Judge; Michael Nifong, District Attorney; Fredericka Carver, Member At Large; Michael Page, Durham County Commissioner; Deborah Schwartz, Member At Large

Staff: Gudrun Parmer, Jo Iverson, Robin Heath, Jonie Coss

Guests: Craig Brown, District Court Judge; Conrad Strader, CJPP Coordinator; Dianne Smith, TASC

Introductions: The meeting was called to order by The Honorable Ann McKown, welcoming everyone. Members and guests introduced themselves.

Minutes: February 21st minutes were presented for approval. Minutes were approved.

Division of Community Corrections (follow up item from last meeting): Judge McKown introduced Geoff Hathaway from DCC. He presented his report by reading the first paragraph from the DCC violation policy. He explained that in the past offenders who violated their probation were sent directly to prison, now the DCC was trying to keep people out of jail. Mr. Hathaway spoke about sanctions and offenders with pending charges who were put on Electronic House Arrest, Electronic Monitoring or intensive curfew. He explained the difference in emergency and non-emergency violations, the two types of violations, which were A and B violations, and explained how each one was processed through the system. He also explained the difference in the level of the violation. He continued his report by explaining the purpose of "Delegated Authority" probation officers had over offenders who were not compliant and allowing officers to address the issues before violating offenders. Mr. Hathaway noted "Delegated Authority" was not used very often. Mr. Hathaway reported 1,155 violations from 01/07 through 05/07 and 773 pending violations. He stated the community probation officers had an average case load of 127 cases and the intermediate officer's case load averaged, it normally was 60. He stated the intensive case load averaged 29 and should be around 30. He mentioned the community level cases were a little high and DCC was addressing the issue by hiring more officers, but still had approximately 16 vacancies to fill.

He stated because the way the system was set up he was unable to capture the number of modifications that lead to additional sanctions without taken the case to court. He explained how those numbers were entered into the system and how the case was resolved. He stated the system did not specify if the case went court or not. He also could not capture the number of

modifications following probation violations. Mr. Hathaway finished his report by mentioning that the percentage of revocations was at 24%, which was below the state average of 36%. There was brief discussion on the level of sanctions and forced treatment.

Judge McKown asked what the process was for Second Chance clients who were not in compliance. Gudrun explained that a monthly report was sent to probation whether or not they were compliant. The report included the percentage of attendance and drug screens taken. She also stated CJRC sent a jeopardy letter to the Chief Probation Officers listing the clients in danger of being terminated from the program. Gudrun stated a large majority of the Second Chance clients were referred from TASC, so TASC was also informing probation.

TASC Program (follow up item from last meeting): Dianne Smith presented her report by explaining the process when an offender did not keep their appointment or if they did not follow through with their treatment. She explained the process for those who were not on probation and how TASC had no recourse for offenders who did not come directly from court. She mentioned those offenders did have a court date so there was no follow up for TASC to report whether the person had reported and completed their paperwork. Dianne explained the process in detail for those who were on supervised probation. She mentioned the vacancy TASC had at the Orange Street office and the back log of about 70 people. She stated Cecelia Ray had a case load of 110. Dianne stated she tried to focus on seeing the Intermediate cases first and then the C level cases. She mentioned if a client tested positive she would work with them as soon as she could. She explained the process of the full assessment was very time consuming, in-depth and a lot of paper work was completed to come up with a diagnosis. She mentioned the majority of those clients were referred to CJRC. She said those probationers who had a lower level of drug usage had to report to their probation officer and to TASC for a certain number of days. Dianne stated the TASC program was just a liaison, a bridge between CJRC, the court, probation and the treatment community. She stated there was a lot of communication between TASC, CJRC and probation concerning the clients' attendance and a monthly report was given to probation. She spoke about the no show rate and how those numbers were astronomical. There was discussion on the no show rate and if there was a way to reduce those numbers.

There was brief discussion on the possibility of having a probation unit supervise the Second Chance clients. Geoff Hathaway stated he was short staffed right now and was in the process of filling those vacancies, but there could be a possibility of getting a probation officer per unit for Second Chance in the future. Gudrun stated the problem was the referrals for Second Chance were much higher than the Day Reporting Center numbers. She stated most DRC cases were coming from court and not from probation modifications. Judge McKown suggested a follow up meeting to talk more about the Second Chance program and client compliance. The meeting was scheduled for Friday, June 8 at 1:30pm. Gudrun invited all board members to attend.

Program Update: Due to time, Jo Iverson recommended the board members review the handout later. The handout included the Monthly Program Highlights, the Monthly Program Report and the CJPP Sentenced Offender Program Summary Report.

Announcements: Gudrun invited board members to the Project Restore Graduation on May 24th, at 2pm. She also announced the next Board Meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, August 15, 2007.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.